

CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY

LDD / ALL Transmittal Number: 9664187 Date Processed: 03/02/2012

### **Notice of Service of Process**

**Primary Contact:** 

Mr. Michael Johnson Law Department

The Hartford One Hartford Plaza Law Department Hartford, CT 06115

Copy of transmittal only provided to:

Massimo Fraschilla

Entity:

Property and Casualty Insurance Company of Hartford . Entity ID Number 2344588

**Entity Served:** 

> Property and Casualty Insurance Company

Title of Action:

The Clever Factory, Inc. vs. Hartford Casualty Insurance Company

Document(s) Type:

Summons/Complaint

Nature of Action:

Contract

Court/Agency:

Davidson County Chancery Court, Tennessee

LAW DEPARTMENT

MAR 05 '12

RECEIVED

Case/Reference No:

12-197-III

Jurisdiction Served:

Indiana

Date Served on CSC:

03/02/2012

Answer or Appearance Due:

30 Days

Originally Served On:

CSC

How Served:

Certified Mail

Sender Information:

William N. Helou 615-846-8000

Notes:

Lines/marks on some pages

Information contained on this transmittal form is for record keeping, notification and forwarding the attached document(s). It does not constitute a legal opinion. The recipient is responsible for interpreting the documents and taking appropriate action.

> To avoid potential delay, please do not send your response to CSC CSC is SAS70 Type II certified for its Litigation Management System. 2711 Centerville Road Wilmington, DE 19808 (888) 690-2882 | sop@cscinfo.com

			CASE FILE NUMBER
STATE OF TENNESSEE			10 300 W -
20TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT	SUM	MONS	12.297-11
CHANCERY COURT		DEFENDANT	
PLAINTIFF		Hartford Casualty	Insurance Company, and
The Clever Factory, Inc.	•	Property and Casua	alty Insurance Company of
		Hartford,	
•			<u> </u>
TO: (NAME AND ADDRESS O	F DEFENDANT)		Method of Service:
Property and Casual	ty Insurance Compan	ny	
c/o Corporation Ser	vice Company, Regis	stered Agent 🗵	Certified Mail
251 E. Ohio Street,	Suite 500		Davidson Co. Sheriff
Indianapolis, India	na 46204		*Comm. Of Insurance
,	•		*Secretary of State
			<pre>*Out of County Sheriff</pre>
			] Private Process Server
		·	] Other
List each defendant on a	separate summons.		*Attach Required Fees
		ED AGAINST YOU IN CH	ANCERY COURT, DAVIDSON COUNTY,
YOU ARE SUMMONED TO DEFE	ND A CIVIL ACTION FIL	ED AGAINST 100 IN OIL	THE DATE THE CHAMONG IS SERVED
TENNESSEE. YOUR DEFENSE M	UST BE MADE WITHIN T	HIRTY (30) DAYS FROM	THE DATE THIS SUMMONS IS SERVED
UPON YOU. YOU MUST FILF YO	OUR DEFENSE WITH THE	CLERK OF THE COURT AL	ND SEND A COPY TO THE PLAINTIFF'S
ATTORNEY AT THE ADDRESS LI	STED BELOW IE VOLLE	ATL TO DEFEND THIS ACT	ION BY THE ABOVE DATE, JUDGMENT
BY DEFAULT CAN BE RENDERED	) AGAINST YOU FOR THE	RELIEF SOUGHT IN THE	COMPLAINT.
<u> </u>			
Attorney for plaintiff or plaintiff if f		LED, ISSUED & ATTESTED	FEB 2 8 2012
(Name, address & telephone number)			FED 2 0 2012
William N. Helou, Esq.			
MGLAW, PLLC	CF CF	RISTI SCOTT, Clerk and Mast	er
2525 West End Avenue,		•	blic Square 308
Nashville, Tennessee	37203		19308 1941   1941   1942   1942   1942   1942   1942   1942   1942   1942   1942   1942   1942   1942   1942   1942
615.846.8000			
			Ga .
		Denuty Ci	erk & Master
	Nomron on		CIN CE TROSCOT
	NOTICE OF 3	DISPOSITION DATE	
The disposition date of the this date or it will be dismissed	nis case is twelve months by the Court for failure to	from date of filing. The opposecute pursuant to T.	case must be resolved or set for trial by R.C.P. 41.02 and Local Rule 18.
If you think the case will and Master at the earliest practi Extensions will be granted only	icable date asking for an e	extension of the disposition	ial, you must send a letter to the Clerk on date and stating your reasons.
TO THE SHERIFF:		DATE RECEIVED	
TO THE CHERKIT			
	,		•
· ·	•	Sheriff	
		ach defendantHEBERY OF ORIGIN.	AL INSTRUMENT FILED IN MY OFFICE.
8	.ADA Coordinator, C	THIS	
•		CF	RISTI COTT, CLERK & MASTER

DEPUTY

	RETURN ON SERVICE OF SUMMONS			
I hereby retum this summons as fo	llows: (Name of Party Served)			
Served     Not Served	□ Not Found			
DATE OF RETURN:	By:			
R	ETURN ON SERVICE O	heriff/or other authorized person to serve process OF SUMMONS BY MAIL	·	
I hereby certify and return that on the	day of	, 20, I sent, postage prepaid, by regis	tered return	
receipt mail or certified return receipt m	ail, a certified copy of the summo	ons and a copy of the complaint in case	to	
the defendant	On the day of _		20	
receipt, which had been signed by		on the day of	,	
The return receipt is attached to this orig			person	
Sworn to and subscribed before me of		authorized by statute to serve process.		
Signature of Notary Public or	Deputy Clerk			
		·		
My Commission Expires:  NOTICE OF PE	RSONAL.	-		
PROPERTY EX	EMPTION			
TO THE DEFENDANT(S):				
Tennessee law provides a ten thous debtor's equity interest personal property	y exemption from execution or	•		
l seignre to satisfy a judgment. If a judgr	hent should be entered against			
you in this action and you wish to claim file a written list, under oath, of the iten	be you wish to claim as exempt			
I with the clerk of the court. The list may	be filed at any time and may			
be changed by you thereafter as necessar	iry; however, unless it is filed			
before the judgment becomes final, it we execution or garnishment issued prior to	ill not be effective as to any the filing of the list. Certain			
litems are automatically exempt by law	and do not need to be listed;	ATTACH		
these include items of necessary wearing	g apparel (clothing) for yourself			
and your family and trunks or other rec such apparel, family portraits, the famil	eptacies necessary to contain books.	RECEIPT		
I Should any of these items he seized voi	i would have the right to	HERE (IF APPLICABLE)		
recover them. If you do not understand exercise it, you may wish to seek the co	your exemption right or now to	(IF APPLICABLE)		
	, and the same of			
Mail list to: Clerk & Master				
1 Public Square Suite 308		·		
Nashville TN 37201	·	·		
Please state file number on list.		CI ADDITION DI EN		
·	CERTIFICATION (I	F APPLICABLE)		
I, Cristi Scott, Clerk & Master of the C	hancery Court in the State of	CRISTI SCOTT, Clerk & Master		
Tennessee, Davidson County, do certificopy of the original summons issued in	this case.	By:	•	
copy of the original culture is trace -		D.C. & M.		

IN THE CHANCERY COURT FOR DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE 8 28 AM 11: 59

TWENTIETH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
AT NASHVILLE

THE CLEVER FACTORY, INC.,

Plaintiff,

V.

HARTFORD CASUALTY INSURANCE

COMPANY, and PROPERTY AND
CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY

CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY

OF HARTFORD,

Defendants.

#### COMPLAINT

Plaintiff The Clever Factory, Inc. ("Clever Factory"), for its complaint against Defendants Hartford Casualty Insurance Company and Property and Casualty Insurance Company of Hartford (collectively, "Hartford"), states as follows:

#### **PARTIES**

- 1. Plaintiff Clever Factory is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Tennessee, with its principal office located at 545 Mainstream Drive, Suite 101, Nashville, Tennessee 37228-1209.
- 2. Defendant Hartford Casualty Insurance Company is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Indiana. Its principal place of business is located at 501 Pennsylvania Parkway, Suite 400, Indianapolis, Indiana 46280-0014. Its registered agent for service of process is Corporation Service Company, 251 E. Ohio Street, Suite 500, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204. This entity is listed on the applicable insurance contract underlying this claim as "Insurer".
- 3. Defendant Property and Casualty Insurance Company of Hartford is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Indiana. Its principal place of

business is located at 501 Pennsylvania Parkway, Suite 400, Indianapolis, Indiana 46280-0014. Its registered agent for service of process is Corporation Service Company, 251 E. Ohio Street, Suite 500, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204. Communications received from counsel for the "Insurer" have purportedly been on behalf of this entity.

#### **JURISDICTION**

- 4. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Clever Factory as it is a corporation organized under the laws of and headquartered in the State of Tennessee.
- 5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Hartford pursuant to Tennessee's Long-Arm Statute, as both Hartford entities have transacted business in the State of Tennessee, entered into contracts for services to be rendered here, and committed certain wrongful acts within this State. See Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 2-2-201, 214, 222-23, and 225.

### <u>VENUE</u>

- 6. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 20-4-101 et seq., as Davidson County is the county where the cause of action arose and where Plaintiff Clever Factory resides or is found.
- 7. This Court has original jurisdiction over the subject matter of this Complaint pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 16-11-101 et seq.

### FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 8. In October 2005, Clever Factory contracted with Hartford for certain insurance coverage. That insurance contract, including all amendments, to the best of Clever Factory's records, is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit A.
- 9. Since that date, Clever Factory has continued to pay premiums to Hartford pursuant to that insurance contract.

- 10. Since that date, Clever Factory has not defaulted upon that insurance contract.
- 11. Pursuant to Section A(1)(b)(1) of the Special Property Coverage Form,

  Hartford agreed to pay Clever Factory for any loss or damage to its "Business Personal

  Property," which is defined, among other things, as, "[p]roperty you own that is used in

  your business[.]"
- 12. Pursuant to Section A(5)(o)(1) of the Special Property Coverage Form, Hartford agreed to pay Clever Factory for the loss of "Business Income" that resulted from the "suspension" of its operations during the "period of restoration".
- 13. Pursuant to Section A(5)(p)(1) of the Special Property Coverage Form, Hartford agreed to pay Clever Factory for "Extra Expense" Clever Factory incurred during the "period of restoration" that it would not have incurred but for a physical loss or damage.
- 14. Pursuant to Section 6(e)(2)(a) and (b) of the Special Property Coverage Form, Clever Factory had the right to extend the insurance that applies to Business Personal Property to apply to: 1) property at the premises Clever Factory acquired or constructed; 2) Business Personal Property that was newly acquired and located at any newly constructed building; and 3) Business Personal Property that was newly acquired and located at the scheduled premises. Clever Factory exercised this contractual right and extended its insurance coverage.
- 15. On May 2, 2011, water from tenants leasing the office space above Clever Factory's office space at 545 Mainstream Drive, Suite 101, Nashville, Tennessee 37228, leaked into Clever Factory's offices.

- 16. The water damaged property owned by Clever Factory that Clever Factory uses in its business.
- 17. Specifically, the water damaged templates for the production of coloring books.
- 18. Clever Factory reported the damage to Hartford representative Rachel Williams on May 2, 20 11.
- 19. At the advice of Jordan Alton, another Hartford Representative, on July 21, 2011, Clever Factory sent the templates to Michigan Disaster Repair, Inc., DBA DocuMedic, for restoration.
- 20. From July 21, 2011, until September 10, 2011, the templates remained at DocuMedic.
- 21. During this time, DocuMedic was unable to restore the templates to their pre-loss condition.
- 22. After being informed of this, Clever Factory and Hartford engaged in conversations related to determining the value of the templates that were not restorable.
- 23. On September 26, 2011, at Hartford's request, Clever Factory, via email, sent Hartford its fair market value analysis of the templates lost. According to that analysis, the fair market value was \$192,000.
- 24. On September 29, 2011, Hartford requested reference materials that would show how Clever Factory arrived at the fair market value in its prior email.
- 25. On October 3, 2011, Clever Factory sent Hartford several reference materials, included contracts for the production of similar templates.

- 26. On October 17, 2011, for the first time since the damage was reported on May 2, 2011, and just after Hartford was informed of the monetary extent of the damage, Hartford sent an email to Clever Factory stating that the templates fell under the "Property Not Covered" section of the Special Property Coverage Form (as defined by Section A(2) of the Special Property Coverage Form and any amendments thereto).
- 27. Again, up until the October 17 email from Hartford, at no point in the previous five months, during which time Hartford and Clever Factory worked to restore the templates, did any Hartford representative assert that the damaged templates fell into the "Property Not Covered" category of the contract.
- 28. The templates are, in fact, "[p]roperty [Clever Factory] own[s] that is used in [its] business[,]" the very definition of Business Personal Property.
- 29. Since the damage to the templates has occurred, Clever Factory has been forced to suspend all operations related to mass producing and selling of items from the damaged templates. That suspension cannot end until the templates are either restored or replaced.
- 30. The suspension of those operations has caused Clever Factory to suffer lost "Business Income".
- 31. The suspension of those operations has caused Clever Factory to pay "Extra Expense".

## CAUSES OF ACTION

# Cause of Action 1 - Breach of Contract

32. Clever Factory incorporates all allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 – 31 herein as if fully set forth.

- 33. Clever Factory contracted with Hartford for insurance coverage as evidenced by Exhibit A.
- 34. Clever Factory incurred damage and loss to property covered by that insurance contract.
- 35. Hartford has refused to provide the full extent of the coverage contracted for in that insurance contract.
  - 36. That refusal is a breach of that insurance contract.
- 37. That breach was committed intentionally and maliciously by Hartford, with full knowledge that it was breaching the insurance contract.
  - 38. That breach has caused and continues to cause Clever Factory damage.

    Cause of Action 2 Violation of the Tennessee Consumer Protection Act
- 39. Clever Factory incorporates all allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 31 herein as if fully set forth.
- 40. Hartford unfairly and deceptively represented to Clever Factory that its Business Personal Property, Business Income, and Extra Expense would be and was covered by the insurance contract for the applicable limits to each.
- 41. A primary reason Clever Factory entered into the insurance contract with Hartford was for the coverage of Business Personal Property, Business Income, and Extra Expense.
- 42. Clever Factory suffered a loss to its Business Personal Property, Business Income, and Extra Expense.
  - 43. Hartford refused to reimburse that loss under the applicable limits each.
- 44. Hartford's unfair and deceptive act of selling insurance coverage for and accepting premium payments for Business Personal Property, Business Income, and

Extra Expense and then refusing to reimburse Clever Factory for damage to each is an unfair and deceptive act pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-18-104(b), et. seq.

- 45. Pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-18-109(a)(1), Clever Factory has a private right of action against Hartford.
- 46. Hartford willfully and knowingly committed the unfair or deceptive acts alleged in this Complaint, i.e., Hartford knowingly and willfully sold insurance to and collected premiums from Clever Factory for coverage of Business Personal Property, Business Income, and Extra Expense while never intending to reimburse Clever Factory for losses to each.
- 47. Pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-18-109(a)(3), as a result of Hartford's willful and knowing deceptive acts, Clever Factory is entitled to treble its damages.
- 48. Pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-18-109(e)(1), Clever Factory is also entitled to its reasonable attorney's fees and costs associated with bringing this action.

## Cause of Action 3 - Fraud in the Inducement

- 49. Clever Factory incorporates all allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 31 herein as if fully set forth.
- 50. Hartford misrepresented to Clever Factory that its Business Personal Property, Business Income, and Extra Expense would be and was covered by the insurance contract for the applicable limits to Business Personal Property.
- 51. Hartford made this misrepresentation knowingly and willfully and with knowledge that Clever Factory was relying upon it.
- 52. Hartford made this misrepresentation to induce Clever Factory to enter into the insurance contract.

- 53. A primary reason Clever Factory entered into the insurance contract with and continued to pay premiums to Hartford was for the coverage of Business Personal Property, Business Income, and Extra Expense for the limits that Hartford advertised.
- 54. Clever Factory was reasonable in its reliance on Hartford's misrepresentation, to its detriment.
- 55. Clever Factory has been damaged by Hartford's misrepresentation, being now in a position in which its Business Personal Property, Business Income, and Extra Expense were damaged and/or lost and/or incurred without insurance coverage for such losses.
- 56. Because Hartford's misrepresentation was made knowingly and willfully, Clever Factory is not only entitled to its actual loss, but is also entitled to a punitive damage award against Hartford.

## In the Alternative to Cause of Action 3:

# Cause of Action 4 - Negligent Misrepresentation

- 57. Clever Factory incorporates all allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 31 herein as if fully set forth.
- 58. Hartford misrepresented to Clever Factory that its Business Personal Property, Business Income, and Extra Expense would be and was covered by the insurance contract for the applicable limits to Business Personal Property.
- 59. Hartford made this misrepresentation negligently and with knowledge that Clever Factory was relying upon it.
- 60. Hartford made this misrepresentation to induce Clever Factory to enter into the insurance contract.

- 61. A primary reason Clever Factory entered into the insurance contract with and continued to pay premiums to Hartford was for the coverage of Business Personal Property, Business Income, and Extra Expense for the limits that Hartford advertised.
- 62. Clever Factory was reasonable in its reliance on Hartford's misrepresentation, to its detriment.
- 63. Clever Factory has been damaged by Hartford's misrepresentation, being now in a position in which its Business Personal Property, Business Income, and Extra Expense were damaged and/or lost and/or incurred without insurance coverage for such losses.

### DEMAND FOR RELIEF

Clever Factory demands judgment on its Complaint as follows:

- (a) An award of compensatory and actual damages related to the damage to and loss of the Business Personal Property, Business Income, and Extra Expense in an amount to be determined at trial;
- (b) Trebling of those compensatory and actual damages due to the willful and knowing violation of the Tennessee Consumer Protection Act;
- (c) An award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred in pursuing this litigation, pursuant to the Tennessee Consumer Protection Act;
- (d) An award of punitive damages against Hartford for its knowing and willful fraud in inducing Clever Factory to enter into and pay premiums related to the insurance contract in an amount to be determined at trial;
  - (e) That court costs be taxed to Hartford;
  - (f) That discretionary costs be awarded to Clever Factory;

- (g) For prejudgment and post-judgment interest; and
- (h) For all other relief to which Clever Factory may be entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

William N. Helou, #22839 (wnh@mglaw.net)

MGLAW, PLLC

2525 West End Avenue, Suite 1475

Nashville, Tennessee 37203

615.846.8000

Fax: 615.846.9000

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF THE CLEVER FACTORY, INC.

MGLAW, PLLC will act as surety for costs in this action not to exceed \$500.00.